

Leaper Graphs

Donald E. Knuth

Computer Science Department
Stanford University

An $\{r, s\}$ -leaper [1, p. 130; 2, p. 30; 3] is a generalized knight that can jump from (x, y) to $(x \pm r, y \pm s)$ or $(x \pm s, y \pm r)$ on a rectangular grid. The graph of an $\{r, s\}$ -leaper on an $m \times n$ board is the set of mn vertices (x, y) for $0 \leq x < m$ and $0 \leq y < n$, with an edge between vertices that are one $\{r, s\}$ -leaper move apart. We call x the *rank* and y the *file* of board position (x, y) . George P. Jelliss [4, 5] raised several interesting questions about these graphs, and established some of their fundamental properties. The purpose of this paper is to characterize when the graphs are connected, for arbitrary r and s , and to determine the smallest boards with Hamiltonian circuits when $s = r + 1$ or $r = 1$.

Theorem 1. *The graph of an $\{r, s\}$ -leaper on an $m \times n$ board, when $2 \leq m \leq n$ and $1 \leq r \leq s$, is connected if and only if the following three conditions hold: (i) $r + s$ is relatively prime to $r - s$; (ii) $n \geq 2s$; (iii) $m \geq r + s$.*

Proof. Condition (i) is necessary because any common divisor d of $r + s$ and $r - s$ will be a divisor of $x + y$ for any vertex (x, y) reachable from $(0, 0)$; any leaper move changes the sum of coordinates by $\pm(r + s)$ or $\pm(s - r)$. If $d > 1$, vertex $(0, 1)$ would therefore be disconnected from $(0, 0)$.

Condition (ii) is necessary because the “middle” point $(\lfloor m/2 \rfloor, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor)$ would otherwise be isolated: If $m \leq n < 2s$ we have $\lfloor m/2 \rfloor - s < 0$, $\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + s \geq m$, $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - s < 0$, and $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + s \geq n$, so there is no place to leap from there.

To show that condition (iii) is necessary we show first that the $\{r, s\}$ -leaper graph on any board with $m = r + s - 1$ and $n = \infty$ has no path from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, 1)$. For this purpose we construct a special path through points (x_k, y_k) as follows:

$$(x_0, y_0) = (r - 1, 0);$$

$$(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) = \begin{cases} (x_k + r, y_k + s), & \text{if } x_k < s - 1; \\ (x_k - s, y_k + r), & \text{if } x_k \geq s. \end{cases}$$

The path terminates when $x_k = s - 1$. It is not difficult to see that termination will occur when $k = r + s - 2$, because the sequence $x_0, x_1, \dots$ runs first through all values $\{0, 1, \dots, r + s - 2\}$ that are congruent to -1 modulo r , then all values congruent to $-1 - s$, then all values congruent to $-1 - 2s$, etc. Since s is relatively prime to r , all residues will occur before we finally reach $-1 - (r - 1)s$ modulo r , which is the class of values congruent to $s - 1$. Now if (x, y) is any point reachable from $(r - 1, 0)$ on this infinite graph, there is a unique value of k such that $x = x_k$. And the difference $y - y_k$ must be an even number, because all $\{r, s\}$ -leaper moves preserve this condition. Therefore the point $(x, y + 1)$ is not reachable from $(r - 1, 0)$.

Condition (iii) is therefore necessary. Vertex $(0, 1)$ will surely be disconnected from $(0, 0)$ on any $m \times n$ board with $m < r + s$ if it is disconnected from $(0, 0)$ on a $(r + s - 1) \times \infty$ board.

Finally we show that conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) are in fact sufficient for connectivity. We need only prove that the graph is connected when $m = r + s$ and $n = 2s$, because the connectivity of an $m \times n$ board obviously implies connectivity for $(m+1) \times n$ and $m \times (n+1)$ boards when $m > 1$. The proof is somewhat delicate, because the graph is, in some sense, “just barely” connected.

Let $m = r + s$ and $n = 2s$, and let t be any number in the range $0 \leq t < n$. Define a path on the $m \times n$ board by the rules

$$(x_0, y_0) = (0, t);$$

$$(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) = \begin{cases} (x_k + r, y_k \pm s), & \text{if } x_k < s; \\ (x_k - s, y_k \pm r), & \text{if } x_k \geq s. \end{cases}$$

The sign of $\pm s$ is uniquely determined by the condition $0 \leq y_{k+1} < 2s$; the sign of $\pm r$ may or may not be forced by this condition, and we can use any desired convention when a choice is possible. The path will reach a point (x_k, y_k) of the form $(0, u)$ when $k = r + s$, after doing s moves by $(r, \pm s)$ and r moves by $(-s, \pm r)$. Therefore $(0, u)$ is reachable from $(0, t)$; we want to use this information to establish connectivity of the graph.

Consider first the case $t = 0$; we will choose the signs so that y_k is either 0 or r or s or $s + r$ for all k . This produces a sequence of files $y_k^{(0)}$. Similarly, when $t = r, s$, or $s + r$, we can keep y_k in the set $\{0, r, s, s + r\}$, and this defines sequences $y_k^{(r)}, y_k^{(s)}, y_k^{(r+s)}$. Now notice that after k steps we have $x_k = ar - bs$ for some uniquely determined a and b , where $k = a + b$, and the value of y_k depends only on the parity of a and b :

a	b	$y_k^{(0)}$	$y_k^{(r)}$	$y_k^{(s)}$	$y_k^{(r+s)}$
even	even	0	r	s	$r + s$
odd	even	s	$r + s$	0	r
odd	odd	$r + s$	s	r	0
even	odd	r	0	$r + s$	s

After $r + s$ steps we have $x_{r+s} = 0$ and $a = s, b = r$. Therefore if r is even and s is odd, we have found paths from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, s)$ and from $(0, r)$ to $(0, r + s)$. Traversing these paths twice shows that $(x, 0)$ and (x, s) are reachable from $(0, 0)$ whenever x is even; similarly, (x, r) and $(x, r + s)$ are reachable from $(0, r)$ whenever x is even. In the other case, when r is odd and s is even, the construction proves that $(x, 0)$ and (x, r) are reachable from $(0, 0)$ whenever x is even, while (x, s) and $(x, r + s)$ are similarly reachable from $(0, s)$. The same argument establishes a more general principle, which can be formulated as follows:

Lemma 1. *Let t be any value such that $0 \leq t < t + r < s$. Then (x, t) is reachable from (z, t) and $(x, t + r)$ is reachable from $(z, t + r)$ whenever $x - z$ is even.*

The proof consists of forming sequences $y_k^{(t)}, y_k^{(t+r)}, y_k^{(t+s)}$, and $y_k^{(t+r+s)}$ as before.

Our next step in proving Theorem 1 is to establish a mild form of connectivity:

Lemma 2. *Every cell on the $(r + s, 2s)$ board is reachable from some cell in file 0. That is, for all (x, y) there is a z such that (x, y) is connected to $(z, 0)$.*

Let us say that file y is *accessible* if its cells are all reachable from file 0. Let $d = s - r$. To prove that all files are accessible, we will start at file 0 and, whenever file y is accessible, we will increase y by d if $y < r$, or decrease y by r if $y \geq r$. This procedure will prove accessibility for all $y < s$. It will then be obvious that all files $y \geq s$ are accessible.

If $r \leq y < s$ and file y is accessible, we can easily show that file $y - r$ is accessible by using Lemma 1. For if $(x, y - r)$ is any cell in file $y - r$, there is a path from $(x, y - r)$ to $(0, y - r)$ or to $(1, y - r)$, and we can go in one step from $(z, y - r)$ to $(z + s, y)$ whenever $z < r$. If $r = z = 1$, we need three steps: $(1, y - 1)$, $(0, y + s - 1)$, $(s, y + s)$, $(s - 1, y)$.

The other case is slightly more complicated. Suppose file y is accessible and $0 \leq y < r$. Let $(x, y + d)$ be any cell on file $y + d$. If $x < r$, we can go to $(x + s, y + d + r)$ to $(x + d, y)$ in two steps, and a similar two-step path applies if $x \geq s$. So the only problematic case arises when $r \leq x < s$. In such a case we can follow a zigzag path

$$(x, y + d), (x - r, y + d + s), (x + d, y + 2d), \dots, (x + kd, y + (k + 1)d)$$

until first reaching $y + (k + 1)d \geq r$. When this occurs, we have $kd \leq y + kd < r$, so $x + kd < s + kd < r + s$ is a legitimate rank. Now we can use Lemma 1 to connect $(x + kd, y + (k + 1)d)$ to either $(0, y + (k + 1)d)$ or $(1, y + (k + 1)d)$. And we can take another zigzag path from $(0, y + (k + 1)d)$ back to file y as desired:

$$(0, y + (k + 1)d), (s, y + (k + 1)d + r), (d, y + kd), \dots, (kd + s, y + d + r), ((k + 1)d, y).$$

Adding $(1, 0)$ to each point of this path will also connect $(1, y + (k + 1)d)$ to file y , unless $kd = r - 1$.

Therefore our proof of Lemma 2 hinges on being able to find a path in the exceptional case $kd = r - 1$. This case can arise only when $y = 0$. Hence we must find a path from $(x, s - 1)$ to file 0, for some odd integer x , whenever the parameters r and s satisfy the special conditions $r = 1 + kd$, $s = 1 + (k + 1)d$. (Such leaper graphs exist whenever $k \geq 0$ and d is odd.) An examination of small cases reveals a strategy that works in general: The path begins

$$\begin{aligned} &(d, s - 1), (s, 2s - 1), \\ &(0, s - 1 + d), (s, s - 1 + d - r), (d, s - 1 + 2d), \dots, (kd, s - 1 + (k + 1)d) = (z - s, 2s - s), \\ &(z, s - 2 + d), (z - s, s - 2 + d - r), (z - d, s - 2 + 2d), \dots, (z - kd, s - 2 + (k + 1)d) = (s, 2s - 3), \end{aligned}$$

where $z = r + s - 1$ is the number of the last rank; the idea is to repeat the $(2k + 1)$ -step staircase subpaths $d - 1$ times, until reaching $(s, 2s - d)$. Since $2s - d = s + r$, this point is two easy steps from file 0; the proof of Lemma 2 is complete.

Lemmas 1 and 2 together show that the graph has at most two connected components, because each vertex is connected either to cell $(0, 0)$ or cell $(1, 0)$ of file 0. Furthermore, the construction in the proof of Lemma 2 shows that (x, y) is connected to $(0, 0)$ if $x + f(y)$ is even, to $(1, 0)$ if $x + f(y)$ is odd, where $f(y)$ is a certain parity function associated with file y . This follows because

the proof connects (x, y) to a cell congruent modulo 2 to $(x + d, y + d)$ when we increase y by d , to $(x + s, y - r)$ when we decrease y by r , and to $(x + r, y + s)$ when we increase y by s . Thus we may take $f(y + d) = f(y) + d$, $f(y - r) = f(y) + s$, and $f(y + s) = f(y) + r$.

But the full cycle of changes in y involves r increases by d and d decreases by r ; so we get back to $y = 0$ with a parity value of $rd + ds$, which is odd. Therefore $(0, 0)$ is connected to $(1, 0)$! The proof of Theorem 1 is complete. $\square$

The next natural question to ask about leaper graphs is whether or not they are Hamiltonian. Indeed, this is an especially appropriate question, because the whole idea of Hamiltonian circuits first arose in connection with knight's tours—which are Hamiltonian paths of the $\{1, 2\}$ -leaper graph on an 8×8 board. Knight's tours have fascinated people for more than 1000 years, yet their secrets have not yet been fully unlocked.

Dawson [6] showed that $\{1, 2k\}$ -leapers have Hamiltonian paths from corner to corner of a $(2k + 1) \times 4k$ board. Therefore the smallest connected graph already has a Hamiltonian path when $r = 1$. However, it turns out that Hamiltonian circuits require larger boards, of size 3×10 or 5×6 when $k = 1$, or 9×10 when $k = 2$. Jelliss [5] derived necessary conditions for the existence of Hamiltonian circuits using $\{r, r + 1\}$ -leapers, and conjectured that the board of smallest area in this special case has size $(2r + 1) \times (6r + 4)$. He proved this conjecture when $r \leq 3$.

The following theorem gives further support to Jelliss's conjecture, because it shows that a board with smallest dimension greater than $2r + 1$ must have an area at least $(4r + 2)^2$; this exceeds $(2r + 1)(6r + 4)$.

Theorem 2. *If $r > 2$ and the graph of an $\{r, r + 1\}$ -leaper on an $m \times n$ board has a Hamiltonian circuit, and if $2r + 1 < m \leq n$, then $m \geq 4r + 2$.*

Proof. Let $s = r + 1$. All vertices (x, y) with $0 \leq x, y < r$ are adjacent only to $(x + r, y + s)$ and $(x + s, y + r)$. Therefore a Hamiltonian circuit must include both of these edges. Similarly, the edges from (x, y) to $(x - r, y + s)$ and $(x - s, y + r)$ are forced when $m - r \leq x < m$ and $0 \leq y < r$.

Therefore, if $2r + 1 < m < 3r + 1$, a “snag” [5] occurs at vertex (r, s) : Any Hamiltonian circuit must lead from this vertex directly to $(0, 0)$, but also to $(2r, 0)$ and $(r + s, 1)$, because $m - r \leq 2r < r + s = 2r + 1 < m$. Only two of these three compulsory moves are possible.

Similarly, if $3r + 1 < m < 4r + 1$, there is a snag at $(2r, s)$. This vertex must connect to $(r - 1, 1)$, $(3r, 0)$, and $(3r + 1, 1)$.

The case $m = 3r + 1$ is impossible if $r > 1$, because vertex $(2r - 1)$ must connect to $(r - 2, 1)$, $(3r - 1, 0)$, and $(3r, 1)$.

Suppose finally that $m = 4r + 1$. Vertex $(r - 1, 2)$ has just two neighbors, $(2r - 1, r + 3)$ and $(2r, r + 2)$, because $r > 2$. Similarly, $(3r + 1, 2)$ is adjacent only to $(2r + 1, r + 3)$ and $(2r, r + 2)$. Therefore $(2r, r + 2)$ must not connect to $(3r, 1)$. But now $(3r, 1)$ has only two remaining options, namely $(4r, r + 2)$ and $(2r - 1, r + 1)$. This makes a snag at $(2r - 1, r + 1)$, which must also link to $(r - 1, 0)$ and $(r - 2, 1)$. $\square$

On the other hand, Jelliss's conjecture does turn out to be false for all $r > 3$, because $\{r, r+1\}$ -leapers continue to acquire new problems on narrow boards as r grows:

Theorem 3. *If $r > 3$ and the graph of an $\{r, r+1\}$ -leaper on a $(2r+1) \times n$ board has a Hamiltonian circuit, then $n \geq r^2 + 5r + 2$ if r is odd, $r^2 + 6r + 4$ if r is even.*

Proof. Let $s = r + 1$, and suppose first that we have a board of size $(2r + 1) \times \infty$. Certain edges are forced to be in any Hamiltonian circuit, because some vertices have degree 2. We will see that such edges, in turn, can force other connections.

Each vertex (x, y) has at most four neighbors. If the x coordinate represents vertical position (rank) and the y coordinate represents horizontal position (file) as in matrix notation, two of these neighbors lie to the “left,” namely $(x \pm r, y - s)$ and $(x \pm s, y - r)$, and two lie to the “right,” $(x \pm r, y + s)$ and $(x \pm s, y + r)$. (If $x \neq r$, there is one choice of sign for $x \pm s$ and $x \pm r$; if $x = r$, neither choice works for $x \pm s$, but both choices are valid for $x \pm r$.)

It will be convenient to use a two-dimensional representation of the files: The notation $[a, b]$ will refer to $as - b$, for $a \geq 1$ and $1 \leq b \leq s$. In terms of this notation, the neighbors of all vertices in file $[a, b]$ belong to files $[a - 1, b]$, $[a - 1, b - 1]$, $[a + 1, b]$, and $[a + 1, b + 1]$. (Appropriate adjustments to these formulas are made when $a = 1$ or $b = 1$ or $b = s$.)

The files are also classified into various types:

Type R : All vertices must link to both right neighbors. (For example, file $[1, s] = 0$ is type R because its vertices have no left neighbors. In fact, file $[1, b]$ is type R for $2 \leq b \leq s$.)

Type R' : The middle vertex, in rank r , must link to both right neighbors. (File $[1, 1]$ is type R' , because vertex (r, r) has no left neighbors; the other vertices in this file have one neighbor to the left.)

Type L : All vertices must link to both left neighbors. (File $[2, s]$ is type L , because both left neighbors of its vertices are in files of type R . In fact, file $[2, b]$ is type L for $3 \leq b \leq s$.)

Type L' : The middle vertex must link to both left neighbors. (File $[2, 2]$ is type L' .)

Type l : All vertices except the middle must link to at least one left neighbor. (File $[1, 1]$ is type l , because for example vertex $(0, r)$ has a left neighbor in file 0, which is type R .)

Type l' : The extreme vertices, in ranks 0 and $2r$, must link to at least one left neighbor. (File $[2, 1] = 2s - 1$ is type l' , because $(0, 2s - 1)$ and $(2r, 2s - 1)$ are the only neighbors of (r, r) .)

Additional types r and r' arise when n is finite, because the right boundary has properties like that of the left.

When file $[a, b]$ is type R , its right neighbors $[a + 1, b]$ and $[a + 1, b + 1]$ must be either type L or l . When $[a, b]$ is type R' , $[a + 1, b]$ is either L or l' . And when files $[a, b]$ and $[a, b + 1]$ both have type L , file $[a + 1, b]$ must have type R ; its left neighbors cannot be used. Such arguments inductively establish the following facts for all $a \leq s$:

$[a, b]$ is type R when a is odd, type L when a is even, for $a < b \leq s$;

$[a, a]$ is type R' when a is odd, type L' when a is even;

$[a, 1]$ is type l when a is odd and $a < s$;

$[a, a]$ is type l when a is even;

$[a, a - 1]$ is type l' when a is even.

Furthermore $[s + 1, s]$ is type l' when r is even. A file can simultaneously have two non-conflicting types; for example, $[1, 1]$ is both R' and l , while $[2, 2]$ is both L' and l . At the other extreme, files with no forced links have no special type.

To prove the theorem, we will show first that all files having special types when $n = \infty$ must be present when n is finite. Theorem 1 tells us that $n \geq 2s$; we want to prove that $n > s^2$. Suppose $n = ks - d$, where $0 \leq d < s$ and $k \leq s$. This right boundary introduces complementary constraints; let

$$\overline{[a, b]} = n - 1 - [a, b] = [k - a, d + 1 - b]$$

be the file that corresponds to $[a, b]$ when left and right are interchanged. Then file $\overline{[a, b]}$ has the type we have derived for $[a, b]$ but with the interchange of L and R , l and r . The value of $n = ks - d$ must be chosen so that complementary types do not conflict.

First, k must be even. For if k is odd, file $(k - 1)s = [k, s]$ is type R or R' ; but it is also file $\overline{[1, d + 1]}$, which is type L or L' .

Second, d must be even. For the leaper graphs are always bipartite—each leap links a “black” square with a “red” square, as on a chessboard—and a bipartite graph cannot be Hamiltonian when it has an odd number of vertices.

Third, d must be zero. Otherwise file $[k, s]$ is type L or l , while it is also $\overline{[1, 1]}$, which is type r . Since L is incompatible with r , we must have $k = s$; files $[1, 1]$ and $s, s]$ will then be of type lr . This, however, forces a “short circuit,”

$$\begin{aligned} & (0, r), (r, r + s), (2r, r), \\ & (r - 1, 0), (2r - 1, r + 1), (r - 2, 1), \dots, (0, r - 1), (r, 2r), (2r, r - 1), \\ & (r - 1, 2r - 1), (2r - 1, r - 2), (r - 2, 2r - 2), \dots, (1, r + 1), (r + 1, 0), (0, r). \end{aligned}$$

Fourth, we must have $k > d$. Otherwise file $[k - 1, k - 1]$, which is type R' , would link to the nonexistent file $[k, k - 1] \geq n$.

Fifth, a contradiction arises even when k and d are even and $0 < d < k \leq s$. Suppose, for example, that $k = 10$ and $d = 6$. All neighbors of vertices in Hamiltonian circuits are then forced except for certain vertices in 24 files:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} [1, 1] & \text{---} & [2, 2] & \text{---} & [3, 3] & \text{---} & [4, 4] & \text{---} & [5, 5] & \text{---} & [6, 6] \\ | & & | & & | & & | & & | & & | \\ [2, 1] & \text{---} & [3, 2] & \text{---} & [4, 3] & \text{---} & [5, 4] & \text{---} & [6, 5] & \text{---} & [7, 6] \\ | & & | & & | & & | & & | & & | \\ [3, 1] & \text{---} & [4, 2] & \text{---} & [5, 3] & \text{---} & [6, 4] & \text{---} & [7, 5] & \text{---} & [8, 6] \\ | & & | & & | & & | & & | & & | \\ [4, 1] & \text{---} & [5, 2] & \text{---} & [6, 3] & \text{---} & [7, 4] & \text{---} & [8, 5] & \text{---} & [9, 6] \end{array}$$

This follows because all files $[a, b]$ with $a < b$ are type R or L ; and all files $\overline{[a, b]}$ with $a < b$ are type L or R . We have $\overline{[a, b]} = [10 - a, 7 - b]$, so the files in the array can also be represented in the dual form

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
\overline{[9, 6]} & \text{---} & \overline{[8, 5]} & \text{---} & \overline{[7, 4]} & \text{---} & \overline{[6, 3]} & \text{---} & \overline{[5, 2]} & \text{---} & \overline{[4, 1]} \\
| & & | & & | & & | & & | & & | \\
\overline{[8, 6]} & \text{---} & \overline{[7, 5]} & \text{---} & \overline{[6, 4]} & \text{---} & \overline{[5, 3]} & \text{---} & \overline{[4, 2]} & \text{---} & \overline{[3, 1]} \\
| & & | & & | & & | & & | & & | \\
\overline{[7, 6]} & \text{---} & \overline{[6, 5]} & \text{---} & \overline{[5, 4]} & \text{---} & \overline{[4, 3]} & \text{---} & \overline{[3, 2]} & \text{---} & \overline{[2, 1]} \\
| & & | & & | & & | & & | & & | \\
\overline{[6, 6]} & \text{---} & \overline{[5, 5]} & \text{---} & \overline{[4, 4]} & \text{---} & \overline{[3, 3]} & \text{---} & \overline{[2, 2]} & \text{---} & \overline{[1, 1]}
\end{array}$$

All links between files are indicated by horizontal and vertical lines in these arrays.

Let us say that a vertex is even or odd according as it belongs to file $[a, b]$ where a is even or odd. All links go between even vertices and odd vertices. The edges of a Hamiltonian circuit that have not been forced by our arguments so far must therefore touch the same number of even vertices as odd vertices. We will obtain a contradiction by showing that the odd vertices have more unspecified neighbors than the even vertices do.

In our example, the 24 files are classified as follows:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
R'l & \text{---} & L'l & \text{---} & R' & \text{---} & L'l & \text{---} & R' & \text{---} & L'l \\
| & & | & & | & & | & & | & & | \\
l' & \text{---} & \emptyset & \text{---} & l' & \text{---} & \emptyset & \text{---} & l' & \text{---} & r \\
| & & | & & | & & | & & | & & | \\
l & \text{---} & r' & \text{---} & \emptyset & \text{---} & r' & \text{---} & \emptyset & \text{---} & r' \\
| & & | & & | & & | & & | & & | \\
R'r & \text{---} & L' & \text{---} & R'r & \text{---} & L' & \text{---} & R'r & \text{---} & L'r
\end{array}$$

An unconstrained file (indicated here by $\emptyset$) has $2r + 1$ vertices with a total of $4r + 2$ unspecified neighbors. Making it type l or r specifies $2r$ of these; making it type l' , r' , L' , or R' specifies 2. The total number of specified neighbors in odd files is $4(2r) + 6(2)$; the total in even files is $6(2r) + 12(2)$. Therefore the odd vertices have an excess of unspecified neighbors; there aren't enough "slots" available to specify them all.

For general k and d , there are $(k - d)d$ files with partially unspecified vertices. There will be $d/2$ odd files of type L' , and $d/2$ of type R' : the same holds for even files. There are $(k - d)/2$ odd files of type l , and $(k - d)/2$ of type r ; there are $d/2$ even files of type l , and $d/2$ of type r . There are no odd files of types l' or r' ; there are $d/2$ even files of each of those types. Therefore the total number of unspecified vertices in even files will balance the total in odd files if and only if

$$(k - d)(2r) = d(2r + 2).$$

The smallest solution to this equation, when $d > 0$ and $k - d > 0$, is $k - d = r + 1$, $d = r$. But then $k = 2r + 1$ exceeds s .

We know therefore that $n > s^2$. Hence all the files of special types, from $[1, s] = 0$ to $[s + 1, s] = s^2$, are present. Further considerations depend on whether r is even or odd.

Suppose r is even. Then the arguments above can be used also in the case $k = s + 1$, except that when $d = 0$ we find that file $[1, 1]$ is of type lr' instead of lr . Contradictions are obtained exactly as before; hence $n > (s + 1)s$.

We cannot have $n = (s + 2)s - d$ for $d = 3, 5, \dots, r - 1$, because file $\overline{[s, s]}$, which is type L' , would be the same as file $[3, d + 1]$, which is type R . The case $d = 1$ is also impossible, because file $\overline{[s + 1, s]}$, which has type r' , is file $[2, 2]$, which has type $L'l$; then vertices $(0, 2r)$ and $(2r, 2r)$ would both link to $(r, r - 1)$ and $(3r, r + 1)$, forming a short circuit. Therefore $n > (s + 2)s$.

We can show $n \geq (s + 3)s$ by letting $n = (s + 3)s - d$ and using the parity argument above with $k = s + 3$. When $d = 2$ the number of odd files of type l (and of type r) will be one less than before, because $[s, 1]$ is not type l , but this just makes the lack of balance even worse. Furthermore, when $d = 0$ and $r > 4$, file $\overline{[r - 1, 1]} = [6, s]$ has conflicting types r and L .

When $r = 4$ and $n = 40 = (s + 3)s$, file $\overline{[s + 1, s]} = [3, 1]$ has types r' and l ; this forces file $[2, 1]$ to be type L' , and a loop is forced from $(r, 2r + 1)$ to $(2r, r)$ to $\dots$ to $(0, r)$ to $(r, 2r + 1)$.

And when $n = (s + 4)s - d$ for $d = 5, 7, \dots, r - 1$, file $\overline{[s, s]} = [5, d + 1]$ has conflicting types L' and R . If $d = 3$, file $\overline{[s + 1, s]} = [4, 4]$ is r' and l , forcing a loop from $(r, 3r - 1)$ to $(0, 4r)$ to $(r, 5r + 1)$ to $(r, 4r)$ to $(r, 3r - 1)$.

Finally, suppose r is odd. We cannot have $n = (s + 1)s - d$ for $d = 2, 4, \dots, r - 1$ because file $\overline{[s, s]} = [2, d + 1]$ has conflicting types $R'r$ and L . The case $d = 0$ is also impossible, because file $\overline{[s, s - 1]} = [2, 2]$ would be of types r' and $L'l$, forcing a short circuit as before. Next, if $n = (s + 2)s - d$, we use the parity argument with $k = s + 2$ when $d > 0$. If $d = 0$ and $r > 3$, file $\overline{[r, 1]} = [4, s]$ has conflicting types r and L . And when $n = (s + 3)s - d$ for $d = 4, 6, \dots, r - 1$, file $\overline{[s, s]} = [4, d + 1]$ has conflicting types $R'r$ and L . $\square$

Theorems 2 and 3 have proved that certain leaper graphs fail to be Hamiltonian. Let us now strike a happier note by constructing infinitely many Hamiltonian circuits, on the boards of smallest area not ruled out by those theorems.

Theorem 4. *The graph of an $\{r, r + 1\}$ -leaper on a $(4r + 2) \times (4r + 2)$ board is Hamiltonian.*

Proof. Let us call the leaper moves NE, NW, EN, ES, SE, SW, WS, and WN, where (N, E, S, W) stand respectively for North, East, South, West, and the first letter indicates the direction of longest leap. North is the direction of decreasing x ; East is the direction of increasing y . Thus NE is a leap from (x, y) to $(x - s, y + r)$; ES goes to $(x + r, y + s)$.

We construct first a highly symmetric set of leaper moves in which every vertex has degree 2, illustrated here in the case $r = 4$:

SE	SE	SE	SE	D_1	SW	SW	SW	A_4	$\overline{A}_4$	SE	SE	SE	$\overline{D}_1$	SW	SW	SW	SW
ES	ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS			ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS	WS
SE	SE	SE	SE	D_2	SW	SW	SW	A_3	$\overline{A}_3$	SE	SE	SE	$\overline{D}_2$	SW	SW	SW	SW
ES	ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS			ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS	WS
SE	SE	SE	SE	D_3	SW	SW	SW	A_2	$\overline{A}_2$	SE	SE	SE	$\overline{D}_3$	SW	SW	SW	SW
ES	ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS			ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS	WS
SE	SE	SE	SE	D_4	SW	SW	SW	A_1	$\overline{A}_1$	SE	SE	SE	$\overline{D}_4$	SW	SW	SW	SW
ES	ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS			ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS	WS
B_1	B_2	B_3	B_4	F_4	E_4	E_3	E_2	E_1	$\overline{E}_1$	$\overline{E}_2$	$\overline{E}_3$	$\overline{E}_4$	$\overline{F}_4$	$\overline{B}_4$	$\overline{B}_3$	$\overline{B}_2$	$\overline{B}_1$
NE	NE	NE	NE	F_3	NW	NW	NW	NW	NE	NE	NE	NE	$\overline{F}_3$	NW	NW	NW	NW
EN	EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN	WN	EN	EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN	WN
NE	NE	NE	NE	F_2	NW	NW	NW	NW	NE	NE	NE	NE	$\overline{F}_2$	NW	NW	NW	NW
EN	EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN	WN	EN	EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN	WN
NE	NE	NE	NE	F_1	NW	NW	NW	NW	NE	NE	NE	NE	$\overline{F}_1$	NW	NW	NW	NW
EN	EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN	WN	EN	EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN	WN
X	NE	NE	NE	C_0	C_1	C_2	C_3	C_4	$\overline{C}_4$	$\overline{C}_3$	$\overline{C}_2$	$\overline{C}_1$	$\overline{C}_0$	NW	NW	NW	$\overline{X}$
	EN	EN	EN											WN	WN	WN	
X'	SE	SE	SE	C'_0	C'_1	C'_2	C'_3	C'_4	$\overline{C}'_4$	$\overline{C}'_3$	$\overline{C}'_2$	$\overline{C}'_1$	$\overline{C}'_0$	SW	SW	SW	$\overline{X}'$
	ES	ES	ES											WS	WS	WS	
SE	SE	SE	SE	F'_1	SW	SW	SW	SW	SE	SE	SE	SE	$\overline{F}'_1$	SW	SW	SW	SW
ES	ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS	WS	ES	ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS	WS
SE	SE	SE	SE	F'_2	SW	SW	SW	SW	SE	SE	SE	SE	$\overline{F}'_2$	SW	SW	SW	SW
ES	ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS	WS	ES	ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS	WS
SE	SE	SE	SE	F'_3	SW	SW	SW	SW	SE	SE	SE	SE	$\overline{F}'_3$	SW	SW	SW	SW
ES	ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS	WS	ES	ES	ES	ES		WS	WS	WS	WS
B'_1	B'_2	B'_3	B'_4	F'_4	E'_4	E'_3	E'_2	E'_1	$\overline{E}'_1$	$\overline{E}'_2$	$\overline{E}'_3$	$\overline{E}'_4$	$\overline{F}'_4$	$\overline{B}'_4$	$\overline{B}'_3$	$\overline{B}'_2$	$\overline{B}'_1$
NE	NE	NE	NE	D'_4	NW	NW	NW	A'_1	$\overline{A}'_1$	NE	NE	NE	$\overline{D}'_4$	NW	NW	NW	NW
EN	EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN			EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN	WN
NE	NE	NE	NE	D'_3	NW	NW	NW	A'_2	$\overline{A}'_2$	NE	NE	NE	$\overline{D}'_3$	NW	NW	NW	NW
EN	EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN			EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN	WN
NE	NE	NE	NE	D'_2	NW	NW	NW	A'_3	$\overline{A}'_3$	NE	NE	NE	$\overline{D}'_2$	NW	NW	NW	NW
EN	EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN			EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN	WN
NE	NE	NE	NE	D'_1	NW	NW	NW	A'_4	$\overline{A}'_4$	NE	NE	NE	$\overline{D}'_1$	NW	NW	NW	NW
EN	EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN			EN	EN	EN		WN	WN	WN	WN

Some vertices have been given names A_j , B_j , etc.; these provide important connecting links. The other, nameless vertices occur in blocks where all links have the same pair of directions; for example, every vertex called $\begin{smallmatrix} \text{SE} \\ \text{ES} \end{smallmatrix}$ is joined to its SE and ES neighbors. These blocks effectively serve as parallel mirrors that provide staircase paths rising or falling at 45° angles.

The named vertices are limited as follows:

- A_j goes WS, ES;
- B_j goes SE, EN;
- C_j goes NW, SW, except C_r goes NW, SE;
- D_j goes SE, SW;
- E_j goes WN, WS, except E_r goes WN, SE;
- F_j goes NW, EN, except F_r goes SW, EN;
- X goes NE, SE.

The directions for complemented vertices like $\overline{A}_j$ are the same but with E and W interchanged; the directions for primed vertices like A'_j are the same but with N and S interchanged. Thus, for example, B'_j goes NE, ES; and $\overline{F}'_r$ goes NE, WS. It is easy to verify that these pairs of directions are consistent.

We can now deduce the connections between named vertices, following paths through unnamed ones. The nearest named neighbors of A_j are B_j and $\overline{F}_j$. The nearest to B_j are A_j and C'_{j-1} . The nearest to C_j are B'_{j+1} (or $\overline{E}'_r$ when $j = r$) and D_j (or E_1 when $j = 0$). The nearest to D_j are C_j and E_j (or X when $j = r$). The nearest to E_j are D_j (or $\overline{C}'_r$ when $j = r$) and F_{j-1} (or C_0 when $j = 1$). The nearest to F_j are $\overline{A}_j$ and E_{j+1} (or X' when $j = r$). And the nearest to X are D_r and F'_r .

Each chain of edges therefore falls into a pattern that depends on the value of $r \bmod 4$. If $r = 4k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} X \dots D_r \dots C_r \dots \overline{E}'_r \dots \overline{F}'_{r-1} \dots A'_{r-1} \dots B'_{r-1} \dots C_{r-2} \dots D_{r-2} \\ \dots E_{r-2} \dots F_{r-3} \dots \overline{A}_{r-3} \dots \overline{B}_{r-3} \dots \overline{C}'_{r-4} \dots \overline{D}'_{r-4} \dots \overline{E}'_{r-4} \dots \\ \dots E_2 \dots F_1 \dots \overline{A}_1 \dots \overline{B}_1 \dots \overline{C}'_0 \dots \overline{E}'_1 \dots \overline{D}'_1 \dots \overline{C}'_1 \dots \overline{B}_2 \dots \overline{A}_2 \dots \\ \dots \overline{A}_{r-2} \dots F_{r-2} \dots E_{r-1} \dots D_{r-1} \dots C_{r-1} \dots B'_r \dots A'_r \dots \overline{F}'_r \dots \overline{X}. \end{aligned}$$

If $r = 4k + 2$ the pattern is almost the same except that the middle transition is complemented and primed:

$$\dots \overline{E}'_2 \dots \overline{F}'_1 \dots A'_1 \dots B'_1 \dots C_0 \dots E_1 \dots D_1 \dots C_1 \dots B'_2 \dots A'_2 \dots$$

If $r = 4k + 1$ the pattern in the middle is

$$\dots E_3 \dots F_2 \dots \overline{A}_2 \dots \overline{B}_2 \dots \overline{C}'_1 \dots \overline{D}'_1 \dots \overline{E}'_1 \dots \overline{C}'_0 \dots \overline{B}_1 \dots \overline{A}_1 \dots \dots$$

ending with $\overline{A}_r \dots F_r \dots X'$. And if $r = 4k + 3$, the middle is again complemented and primed.

Consequently the edges defined above make exactly two circuits altogether. If r is even, one circuit contains X and $\overline{X}$, the other contains X' and $\overline{X}'$. If r is odd, the circuits contain $\{X, X'\}$ and $\{\overline{X}, \overline{X}'\}$, respectively.

A small change now joins the circuits together into a single Hamiltonian circuit. We simply replace the subpaths

$$F'_r, X, D_r, C_r, \overline{E}'_r \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{F}_r, \overline{X}', \overline{D}'_r, \overline{X}', \overline{E}'_r,$$

by

$$F'_r, C_r, D_r, X, E_r \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{F}_r, \overline{C}'_r, \overline{D}'_r, \overline{X}', \overline{E}'_r,$$

respectively. $\square$

The proof of Theorem 4 leads, for example, to the following 18×18 leaper tour when $r = 4$:

0	272	220	43	53	333	363	104	183	83	4	263	233	153	143	320	372	100
270	222	41	55	212	51	331	365	102	2	265	231	151	312	155	141	322	370
224	38	57	210	277	214	48	328	367	267	228	148	314	377	310	157	138	324
36	60	207	280	386	275	216	46	326	226	146	316	375	286	380	307	160	136
334	362	105	182	84	388	273	218	44	144	318	373	88	184	82	5	262	234
52	332	364	103	1	271	221	42	54	154	142	321	371	101	3	264	232	152
213	50	330	366	268	223	40	56	211	311	156	140	323	368	266	230	150	313
276	215	47	327	225	37	58	208	278	378	308	158	137	325	227	147	315	376
387	274	217	45	35	61	206	281	385	287	381	306	161	135	145	317	374	285
85	174	117	345	335	361	106	181	87	185	81	6	261	235	245	17	74	187
176	115	347	27	125	337	358	108	178	78	8	258	237	25	127	247	15	76
113	350	30	66	168	123	340	356	111	11	256	240	23	68	166	130	250	13
352	32	64	203	301	171	121	342	354	254	242	21	71	201	303	164	132	252
34	62	205	282	384	288	173	118	344	244	18	73	188	284	382	305	162	134
336	360	107	180	86	175	116	346	26	126	246	16	75	186	80	7	260	236
124	338	357	110	177	114	348	28	67	167	128	248	14	77	10	257	238	24
170	122	341	355	112	351	31	65	202	302	165	131	251	12	255	241	22	70
300	172	120	343	353	33	63	204	283	383	304	163	133	253	243	20	72	200

(Radix 9 notation is used here so that the near-fourfold symmetry is revealed.) This tour was found by an exhaustive computer calculation, which determined that exactly 16 different leaper tours on this board have 180° symmetry; none have 90° symmetry. The chosen tour exhibited maximum symmetry under the circumstances, and fortunately it could be generalized to arbitrary r .

Theorem 4 applies in particular when $r = 1$. We get the well known 6×6 knight's tour

0	36	13	23	6	30
12	24	38	28	14	22
37	1	35	7	31	5
25	11	27	15	21	17
2	34	8	18	4	32
10	26	3	33	16	20

(again in radix 9).

A. H. Frost showed a century ago that the graphs for $\{1, 4\}$ -leapers and $\{2, 3\}$ -leapers are Hamiltonian on a 10×10 board [7, plate VII]. T. H. Willcocks showed more recently that $\{2, 5\}$ -leapers and $\{3, 4\}$ -leapers are Hamiltonian on a 14×14 [8]. Willcocks conjectured that an $\{r, s\}$ -leaper has a Hamiltonian circuit on a $2(r+s) \times 2(r+s)$ board whenever $s-r$ and $s+r$ are relatively prime. Theorem 4 establishes infinitely many cases of this conjecture, and computer calculations have verified it whenever $r+s < 15$. The computer had to work hard only in the case $r = 5$, $s = 8$.

We can verify Willcocks's conjecture also in the other extreme case, when $r = 1$:

Theorem 5. *The graph of a $\{1, 2k\}$ -leaper on a $(4k+2) \times (4k+2)$ board is Hamiltonian.*

Proof. Let $s = 2k$. We give symbolic names to the vertices as follows, illustrated here in the case $k = 4$:

O	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	H_2	K_4	.	.	.	B_{22}	.	B_{12}	.	A_2	$\overline{O}$
K_5	.	.	.	B_{21}	.	B_{11}	.	A_1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	H_1	K_3	.
.	G_2	.	G_4	.	G_6	.	G_8	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
.	.	W_{11}^0	X_{11}^0	W_{12}^0	X_{12}^0	W_{13}^0	X_{13}^0	.	.	Y_{11}^1	Z_{11}^1	Y_{12}^1	Z_{12}^1	Y_{13}^1	Z_{13}^1	J_{12}	.	
.	F_{11}	Y_{11}^0	Z_{11}^0	Y_{12}^0	Z_{12}^0	Y_{13}^0	Z_{13}^0	J_{11}	.	W_{11}^1	X_{11}^1	W_{12}^1	X_{12}^1	W_{13}^1	X_{13}^1	.	.	
.	.	W_{21}^0	X_{21}^0	W_{22}^0	X_{22}^0	W_{23}^0	X_{23}^0	.	E_{13}	Y_{21}^1	Z_{21}^1	Y_{22}^1	Z_{22}^1	Y_{23}^1	Z_{23}^1	I_{13}	.	
.	E_{12}	Y_{21}^0	Z_{21}^0	Y_{22}^0	Z_{22}^0	Y_{23}^0	Z_{23}^0	.	.	W_{21}^1	X_{21}^1	W_{22}^1	X_{22}^1	W_{23}^1	X_{23}^1	.	.	
.	.	.	D_2	.	D_4	.	D_6	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	H_4	.
.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	H_3	.	.	B_{23}	.	B_{13}	.	A_3	.	.	
.	K_6	.	B_{26}	.	B_{16}	.	A_4	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	K_2	
G_1	.	G_3	.	G_5	.	G_7	.	.	K_1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	
.	.	X_{11}^2	W_{11}^2	X_{12}^2	W_{12}^2	X_{13}^2	W_{13}^2	F_{13}	.	Z_{11}^3	Y_{11}^3	Z_{12}^3	Y_{12}^3	Z_{13}^3	Y_{13}^3	.	J_{13}	
F_{12}	.	Z_{11}^2	Y_{11}^2	Z_{12}^2	Y_{12}^2	Z_{13}^2	Y_{13}^2	.	.	X_{11}^3	W_{11}^3	X_{12}^3	W_{12}^3	X_{13}^3	W_{13}^3	.	.	
.	.	X_{21}^2	W_{21}^2	X_{22}^2	W_{22}^2	X_{23}^2	W_{23}^2	.	.	Z_{21}^3	Y_{21}^3	Z_{22}^3	Y_{22}^3	Z_{23}^3	Y_{23}^3	.	I_{12}	
E_{11}	.	Z_{21}^2	Y_{21}^2	Z_{22}^2	Y_{22}^2	Z_{23}^2	Y_{23}^2	.	I_{11}	X_{21}^3	W_{21}^3	X_{22}^3	W_{22}^3	X_{23}^3	W_{23}^3	.	.	
.	.	D_1	.	D_3	.	D_5	.	D_7	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	H_5	
.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	C_2	.	B_{24}	.	B_{14}	.	.	.	
O'	.	C_1	.	B_{25}	.	B_{15}	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	$\overline{O}'$	

Positions marked '.' obtain names by complementation (left-right reflection) and/or priming (up-down reflection). Thus, for example, the full names of the positions on the top row are

$$O \ \overline{A}_2 \ C'_1 \ \overline{B}_{12} \ B'_{25} \ \overline{B}_{22} \ B'_{15} \ H_2 \ K_4 \ \overline{K}_4 \ \overline{H}_2 \ \overline{B}'_{15} \ B_{22} \ \overline{B}'_{25} \ B_{12} \ \overline{C}'_1 \ A_2 \ \overline{O};$$

the dots help keep the diagram from being more cluttered than it already is. The names in general are

$$A_1, \dots, A_4; B_{i1}, \dots, B_{i6}; C_1, C_2; D_1, \dots, D_{s-1};$$

$$E_{p1}, E_{p2}, E_{p3}; F_{q1}, F_{q2}, F_{q3}; G_1, \dots, G_s; H_1, \dots, H_5;$$

$$I_{p1}, I_{p2}, I_{p3}; J_{q1}, J_{q2}, J_{q3}; K_1, \dots, K_6; W_{ij}^a, X_{ij}^a, Y_{ij}^a, Z_{ij}^a;$$

here $1 \leq a \leq 4$, $1 \leq i \leq k-2$, $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, $1 \leq p < \lceil k/2 \rceil$, and $1 \leq q < \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$.

The names E_{pl} occur two positions to the left of $Z_{(k-2p)1}^a$, where $a = (2, 0, 1)$ for $l = (1, 2, 3)$ respectively. The names F_{ql} occur two positions to the left of $Z_{(k-2q-1)1}^a$, where $a = (0, 2, 3)$. The names I_{pl} occur two positions to the right of $Y_{(k-2p)(k-1)}^a$, where $a = (2, 3, 1)$ if k is even, $a = (0, 1, 3)$ if k is odd; the names J_{ql} occur two positions to the right of $Y_{(k-2q-1)(k-1)}^a$, where $a = (0, 1, 3)$ if k is even, $a = (2, 3, 1)$ if k is odd. The positions of the other names are self-evident. We may assume that $k \geq 3$.

To show that the graph is Hamiltonian, we will first link the vertices in six closed circuits, then we will join those circuits together. The basic circuit, if $k = 2l + 2$, is

$$\begin{aligned} &O, A_1, \dots, A_4, B_{11}, \dots, B_{16}, \dots, B_{(k-2)1}, \dots, B_{(k-2)6}, C_1, C_2, D_1, \dots, D_{s-1}, \\ &E_{11}, E_{12}, E_{13}, F_{11}, F_{12}, F_{13}, E_{21}, \dots, F_{l3}, G_1, \dots, G_s, H_1, \dots, H_5, \\ &I_{11}, I_{12}, I_{13}, J_{11}, J_{12}, J_{13}, I_{21}, \dots, J_{l3}, K_1, \dots, K_6, \\ &O', A'_1, \dots, K'_6, O. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $k = 2l + 1$, the basic circuit is

$$\begin{aligned} &O, A_1, \dots, A_4, B_{11}, \dots, B_{16}, \dots, B_{(k-2)1}, \dots, B_{(k-2)6}, C_1, C_2, D_1, \dots, D_{s-1}, \\ &E_{11}, E_{12}, E_{13}, F_{21}, F_{12}, F_{13}, E_{21}, \dots, E_{l3}, H'_5, \dots, H'_1, G'_s, \dots, G'_1, \\ &I_{11}, I_{12}, I_{13}, J_{11}, J_{12}, J_{13}, I_{21}, \dots, I_{l3}, K_1, \dots, K_6, \\ &O', A'_1, \dots, K'_6, O. \end{aligned}$$

Another basic circuit is obtained by complementing everything. We also form W , X , Y , and Z circuits as follows, when $i = k - 2$ and $j = k - 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} &W_{11}^0, W_{11}^1, W_{21}^0, W_{21}^1, \dots, W_{i1}^0, W_{i1}^1, \alpha_i, \alpha_{i-1}, \dots, \alpha_1, \\ &\alpha_l = W_{l1}^3, W_{l2}^1, W_{l2}^3, \dots, W_{lj}^1, W_{lj}^3, W_{lj}^2, W_{lj}^0, W_{li}^2, \dots, W_{l2}^0, W_{l1}^2; \\ &X_{11}^2, X_{11}^3, X_{21}^2, X_{21}^3, \dots, X_{i1}^2, X_{i1}^3, \beta_i, \beta_{i-1}, \dots, \beta_1, \\ &\beta_l = X_{l1}^1, X_{l2}^3, X_{l2}^1, \dots, X_{lj}^3, X_{lj}^1, X_{lj}^0, X_{lj}^2, X_{li}^0, \dots, X_{l2}^2, X_{l1}^0; \\ &Y_{11}^1, Y_{11}^0, Y_{21}^1, Y_{21}^0, \dots, Y_{i1}^1, Y_{i1}^0, \gamma_i, \gamma_{i-1}, \dots, \gamma_1, \\ &\gamma_l = Y_{l1}^2, Y_{l2}^0, Y_{l2}^2, \dots, Y_{lj}^0, Y_{lj}^2, Y_{lj}^3, Y_{lj}^1, Y_{li}^3, \dots, Y_{l2}^1, Y_{l1}^3; \\ &Z_{11}^3, Z_{11}^2, Z_{21}^3, Z_{21}^2, \dots, Z_{i1}^3, Z_{i1}^2, \delta_i, \delta_{i-1}, \dots, \delta_1, \\ &\delta_l = Z_{l1}^0, Z_{l2}^2, Z_{l2}^0, \dots, Z_{lj}^2, Z_{lj}^0, Z_{lj}^1, Z_{lj}^3, Z_{li}^1, \dots, Z_{l2}^3, Z_{l1}^1. \end{aligned}$$

Circuits can be spliced together when we have consecutive vertices (u_1, u_2) in one circuit and (v_1, v_2) in another, where u_1 is adjacent to v_1 and u_2 is adjacent to v_2 . The pairs

$$\begin{aligned} (E_{12}, E_{13}) & \quad (Z_{i1}^2, Z_{i1}^3) \\ (E'_{12}, E'_{13}) & \quad (W_{11}^0, W_{11}^1) \\ (\overline{D}_2, \overline{D}_3) & \quad (Y_{ii}^2, Y_{ij}^0) \\ (\overline{D}'_2, \overline{D}'_3) & \quad (X_{1i}^0, X_{1j}^2) \\ (\overline{G}'_3, \overline{G}_3) & \quad (Z_{ij}^2, Z_{ij}^0) \end{aligned}$$

satisfy this property and suffice to complete the proof. For the first two pairs hook the Z and W circuits into the basic circuit, and the next two hook the Y and X circuits into its complement; the last pair hooks the Z circuit, which is now part of the basic circuit, into the complement. $\square$

As an example of the construction in Theorem 5, here is the the 22×22 circuit that arises when $s = 10$:

```

0  143 386 139 384 133 378 127 372 457 360 269 172 257 18 251 12 245 6 243 2 145
361 270 171 258 17 252 11 246 5 242 1 144 387 140 383 134 377 128 371 458 359 268
54 467 388 465 390 463 392 461 394 459 396 185 170 187 168 189 166 191 164 241 162 333
397 274 399 196 401 194 403 192 405 238 55 332 81 320 83 318 85 316 87 314 355 184
158 331 80 307 94 309 92 311 90 313 354 275 446 231 412 233 410 235 408 237 56 471
449 276 445 230 415 228 417 226 419 224 157 472 79 306 97 304 99 302 101 300 353 180
156 327 78 293 108 295 106 297 104 299 450 179 444 217 426 219 424 221 422 223 60 473
451 280 443 216 429 214 431 212 433 210 61 326 77 292 111 290 113 288 115 286 349 178
152 35 76 37 74 39 72 41 118 285 348 281 442 203 440 205 438 207 436 209 62 477
347 174 345 26 343 28 341 30 339 32 151 478 65 48 67 46 69 44 119 284 455 282
150 483 142 385 138 379 132 373 126 367 456 173 262 19 256 13 250 7 244 3 146 479
271 362 263 22 259 16 253 10 247 4 335 52 141 382 135 376 129 370 123 366 267 358
468 53 466 389 464 391 462 393 460 395 272 357 186 169 188 167 190 165 240 163 334 161
273 398 197 400 195 402 193 404 239 406 469 160 321 82 319 84 317 86 315 88 183 356
330 159 322 95 308 93 310 91 312 89 182 447 198 413 232 411 234 409 236 407 470 57
277 448 199 414 229 416 227 418 225 420 329 58 323 96 305 98 303 100 301 102 181 352
328 155 324 109 294 107 296 105 298 103 278 351 200 427 218 425 220 423 222 421 474 59
279 452 201 428 215 430 213 432 211 434 475 154 325 110 291 112 289 114 287 116 177 350
34 153 36 75 38 73 40 71 42 117 176 453 202 441 204 439 206 437 208 435 476 63
175 346 25 344 27 342 29 340 31 338 33 64 49 66 47 68 45 70 43 120 283 454
482 149 50 137 380 131 374 125 368 121 364 265 24 261 20 255 14 249 8 337 480 147
363 264 23 260 21 254 15 248 9 336 481 148 51 136 381 130 375 124 369 122 365 266

```

Leapers with $r = 1$ can in fact tour a slightly smaller board:

Theorem 6. *The graph of a $\{1, 2k\}$ -leaper on a $(4k + 1) \times (4k + 2)$ board is Hamiltonian.*

Proof. This time the construction is simpler. We may assume that $k \geq 2$, because Euler [9] constructed a 5×6 knight's tour. The case $k = 2$ was solved by Huber-Stockar [10], whose method can be generalized to all larger values of k . We assign names as follows, illustrated when $k = 4$:

.	$\overline{X}_4$	X_1	A_1^3	A_1^4	A_1^5	A_1^6	A_1^7	.	Y_1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Z_2
.	Y_6	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Z_3	X_2	A_2^3	A_2^4	A_2^5	A_2^6	A_2^7	.	Y_2
X_7	.	X_9	A_5^3	A_5^4	A_5^5	A_5^6	A_5^7	.	Y_9	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_5
.	Y_{14}	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_6	.	X_{10}	A_6^3	A_6^4	A_6^5	A_6^6	A_6^7	.	Y_{10}
X_{15}	.	X_{17}	A_9^3	A_9^4	A_9^5	A_9^6	A_9^7	.	Y_{17}	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_{13}
.	Y_{22}	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_{14}	.	X_{18}	A_{10}^3	A_{10}^4	A_{10}^5	A_{10}^6	A_{10}^7	.	Y_{18}
X_{23}	.	X_{25}	A_{13}^3	A_{13}^4	A_{13}^5	A_{13}^6	A_{13}^7	.	Y_{25}	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_{21}
.	Y_{30}	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_{22}	.	X_{26}	A_{14}^3	A_{14}^4	A_{14}^5	A_{14}^6	A_{14}^7	.	Y_{26}
Z_5	.	B_2	B_3	B_4	B_5	B_6	B_7	B_8	$\overline{B}_8$	$\overline{B}_7$	$\overline{B}_6$	$\overline{B}_5$	$\overline{B}_4$	$\overline{B}_3$	$\overline{B}_2$	Z_1	.
Y_5	.	Y_7	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_3	A_3^3	A_3^4	A_3^5	A_3^6	A_3^7	.	Y_3	.
.	X_8	A_4^3	A_4^4	A_4^5	A_4^6	A_4^7	.	Y_4	.	Y_8	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_4
Y_{13}	.	Y_{15}	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_{11}	A_7^3	A_7^4	A_7^5	A_7^6	A_7^7	.	Y_{11}	.
.	X_{16}	A_8^3	A_8^4	A_8^5	A_8^6	A_8^7	.	Y_{12}	.	Y_{16}	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_{12}
Y_{21}	.	Y_{23}	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_{19}	A_{11}^3	A_{11}^4	A_{11}^5	A_{11}^6	A_{11}^7	.	Y_{19}	.
.	X_{24}	A_{12}^3	A_{12}^4	A_{12}^5	A_{12}^6	A_{12}^7	.	Y_{20}	.	Y_{24}	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_{20}
Y_{29}	.	Y_{31}	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_{27}	A_{15}^3	A_{15}^4	A_{15}^5	A_{15}^6	A_{15}^7	.	Y_{27}	.
.	Z_6	A_{16}^3	A_{16}^4	A_{16}^5	A_{16}^6	A_{16}^7	.	Y_{28}	.	Y_{32}	.	.	.	.	.	.	X_{28}

As in the proof of Theorem 5, dots stand for names obtained by complementation (left-right reflection). The vertex names, in general, are

$$A_1^j, \dots, A_{4k}^j, \quad \text{for } 2 < j < 2k; \quad B_2, \dots, B_{2k}; \\ X_1, \dots, X_{8k-4}; \quad Y_1, \dots, Y_{8k}; \quad Z_1, \dots, Z_6.$$

Notice that the graph contains paths

$$(B_{j-1} \text{ or } B_{j+1}), A_1^j, \dots, A_{4k}^j, (B_{j-2} \text{ or } B_j)$$

for $2 < j < 2k$, except that vertex B_{j-2} is not present when $j = 3$.

Let α_j be the path $B_{j-2}, A_{4k}^j, \dots, A_1^j, B_{j+1}, A_{4k}^{j+1}, \dots, A_1^{j+1}$, when $2 < j < 2k$ and j is even. This path α_j can be followed by vertex B_{j+2} . Therefore we can get from X_1 to B_{2k-2} and to B_{2k} via the disjoint paths

$$X_1, \dots, X_{8k-4}, Z_1, \dots, Z_6, \alpha_4, \alpha_8, \dots, \alpha_{2k-4}, B_{2k-2} \\ \text{and } X_1, B_3, A_{4k}^3, \dots, A_1^3, \alpha_6, \alpha_{10}, \dots, \alpha_{2k-2}, B_{2k}$$

when k is even,

$$X_1, \dots, X_{8k-4}, Z_1, \dots, Z_6, \alpha_4, \alpha_8, \dots, \alpha_{2k-2}, B_{2k} \\ \text{and } X_1, B_3, A_{4k}^3, \dots, A_1^3, \alpha_6, \alpha_{10}, \dots, \alpha_{2k-4}, B_{2k-2}$$

when k is odd. Since $Y_1, \dots, Y_{8k}$ is a path from B_{2k} to $\overline{B}_{2k-2}$, we obtain a path from B_{2k-2} to $\overline{B}_{2k-2}$ that runs through all vertices with uncomplemented names. This path plus its complement is the desired Hamiltonian circuit. $\square$

The board in Theorem 6 turns out to be as small as possible.

Theorem 7. *A $\{1, 2k\}$ -leaper has no Hamiltonian circuit on a board of area less than $(4k+1)(4k+2)$.*

Proof. Consider the $\{1, 2k\}$ -leaper graph on an $m \times n$ board with $m \leq n$ and $2k+1 \leq m \leq 4k$. If m is even, we can show that no Hamiltonian circuit exists by using an argument due to de Jaenisch [11, page 46], Flye Sainte-Marie [12], and Jelliss [8]: Say that vertex (x, y) is type A if y is even, x is even, and $x < 2k$, or if y is odd, x is odd, and $x \geq m - 2k$; it is of type B if y is even, x is odd, and $x < 2k$, or if y is odd, x is even, and $x \geq m - 2k$; it is type C otherwise. Type A vertices are adjacent only to vertices of type B , but there are no more B 's than A 's. Therefore the only possible circuit containing all the A 's has the form $ABAB \dots AB$. But such a circuit misses all the C 's.

Suppose therefore that m is odd, say $m = 2l + 1$. Then $l \geq k$ and $n \geq 4k$, by Theorem 1. The links from (l, y) to $(l \pm 1, y + 2k)$ are forced when $y < 2k$, because $l < 2k$. The case $n = 4k$ is impossible by the argument in the previous paragraph, when the ranks and files of the board are transposed. Therefore $n > 4k$, and a short circuit from $(l, 0)$ to $(l \pm 1, 2k)$ to $(l, 4k)$ is forced unless $n > 6k$. Indeed, if $6k \leq n < 8k$, a short circuit from $(l, n - 6k)$ to $(l \pm 1, n - 4k)$ to $(l, n - 2k)$ is forced. Consequently we have $n \geq 8k$. (This argument, in the case $k = 2$, was suggested by Jelliss in a letter to the author.)

If $m \geq 2k + 3$ we have therefore $mn \geq 16k^2 + 24k > (4k + 1)(4k + 2)$. And if $m = 2k + 1$ and $n \neq 8k$ we have $mn \geq (2k + 1)(8k + 2) = (4k + 1)(4k + 2)$ because n must be even.

The remaining case is quite interesting, because we will see that a Hamiltonian path (but not a circuit) is possible. Let $m = 2k + 1$ and $n = 8k$, and assume that a Hamiltonian circuit exists. We will write $u \sim v$ if u and v are adjacent vertices of the circuit. Vertices of degree 2 force the connections

$$(x, y) \sim (x + 1, y + 2k), \quad (x, y) \sim (x - 1, y + 2k),$$

for $0 < x < 2k$ and $0 \leq y < 2k$; also at the corners we have

$$(0, 0) \sim (1, 2k), \quad (0, 0) \sim (2k, 1), \quad (2k, 0) \sim (0, 1), \quad (2k, 0) \sim (2k - 1, 2k).$$

Notice that both neighbors of (x, y) in the circuit have now been identified whenever $1 < x < 2k - 1$ and $y < 4k$; by symmetry, the same is true in the right half of the board, when $y \geq 4k$. Our goal is to deduce the behavior of the circuit on the remaining vertices, which lie in the top two and bottom two ranks of the board. We will assume that $k > 1$, so that these four ranks are distinct. A similar (and much simpler) argument applies when $k = 1$.

Let $\overline{(x, y)} = (2k - x, 8k - 1 - y)$ be the point opposite (x, y) with respect to the center of the board. Whenever we deduce that $u \sim v$, a symmetric derivation proves that $\overline{u} \sim \overline{v}$; such consequences need not be stated explicitly.

We must have either $(0, 4k - 1) \sim (2k, 4k - 2)$ or $(0, 4k - 1) \sim (2k, 4k) = \overline{(0, 4k - 1)}$, because $(0, 4k - 1) \not\sim (1, 6k - 1) = \overline{(2k - 1, 2k)}$; the latter is joined to $\overline{(2k, 0)}$ and $\overline{(2k, 2)}$. Similarly, either $(2k, 4k - 1) \sim (0, 4k - 2)$ or $(2k, 4k - 1) \sim \overline{(2k, 4k - 1)}$. These choices are not independent. For if $(0, 4k - 1) \sim (2k, 4k - 2)$ and $(2k, 4k - 1) \sim (0, 4k - 2)$, there is a short circuit

$$\begin{aligned} (0, 4k - 1) &\sim (1, 2k - 1) \sim \cdots \sim (2k - 1, 2k - 1) \sim (2k, 4k - 1) \\ &\sim (0, 4k - 2) \sim \cdots \sim (2k, 4k - 2) \sim (0, 4k - 1); \end{aligned}$$

likewise the connections $(0, 4k - 1) \sim \overline{(0, 4k - 1)}$ and $(2k, 4k - 1) \sim \overline{(2k, 4k - 1)}$ force a short circuit

$$(0, 4k - 1) \sim \cdots \sim (2k, 4k - 1) \sim \overline{(2k, 4k - 1)} \sim \cdots \sim \overline{(0, 4k - 1)} \sim (0, 4k - 1).$$

By symmetry we can therefore assume without loss of generality that

$$(0, 4k - 1) \sim (2k, 4k - 2) \quad \text{and} \quad (2k, 4k - 1) \sim \overline{(2k, 4k - 1)}.$$

These connections imply also $\overline{(0, 4k - 1)} \sim \overline{(2k, 4k - 2)}$; we still are able to claim legitimately below that $\bar{u} \sim \bar{v}$ holds whenever we have deduced that $u \sim v$.

Further detective work establishes $(1, 2k + 1) \sim (0, 1)$, because $(1, 2k + 1) \not\sim (0, 4k + 1) = \overline{(2k, 4k - 2)}$. Therefore the circuit contains the path

$$(2k, 1) \sim (0, 0) \sim \cdots \sim (2k, 0) \sim (0, 1) \sim (1, 2k + 1) \sim (2, 1) \sim \cdots \sim (2k - 2, 1) \sim (2k - 1, 2k + 1);$$

it follows that $(2k, 1) \not\sim (2k - 1, 2k + 1)$. The only possibilities remaining are $(2k, 1) \sim (0, 2)$ and $(2k - 1, 2k + 1) \sim (2k, 4k + 1) = \overline{(0, 4k - 2)}$.

Now we can establish, in fact, the relations

$$(1, 2k + 2j - 1) \sim (0, 2j - 1) \sim (2k, 2j - 2), \quad (0, 4k - 2j + 1) \sim (2k, 4k - 2j),$$

for $1 \leq j \leq k$. They have been verified when $j = 1$; suppose we know them for some $j < k$. Then $(2k, 2j) \not\sim (0, 2j - 1)$, hence $(2k, 2j) \sim (0, 2j + 1)$ and $(2k, 2j) \sim (2k - 1, 2k + 2j)$. Hence $(0, 4k - 2j - 1) \not\sim (1, 6k - 2j - 1) = \overline{(2k - 1, 2k + 2j)}$; we must have $(0, 4k - 2j - 1) \sim (2k, 4k - 2j - 2)$. This in turn forces $(1, 2k + 2j + 1) \sim (0, 2j + 1)$, because $(1, 2k + 2j + 1)$ can't be joined to $(0, 4k + 2j + 1) = \overline{(2k, 4k - 2j - 2)}$. The induction on j is complete, and we have also proved

$$(2k, 2j) \sim (2k - 1, 2k + 2j) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j < k.$$

One consequence of our deductions so far is the existence of a rather long path,

$$\begin{aligned} (0, 2) \sim (2k, 1) \sim \cdots \sim (2k - 1, 2k + 1) \sim \overline{(0, 4k - 2)} \sim \cdots \sim \overline{(2k, 4k - 2)} \sim \overline{(0, 4k - 1)} \\ \sim \cdots \sim \overline{(2k, 4k - 1)} \sim (2k, 4k - 1) \sim \cdots \sim \overline{(0, 2)}. \end{aligned}$$

We've also found paths from $(0, 2k + 2j - 2)$ to $(2k, 2k + 2j - 1)$ and from $(1, 2k + 2j)$ to $(2k - 1, 2k + 2j + 1)$, for $1 \leq j < k$.

The final phase of the proof consists of establishing the relations

j odd	j even
$(0, 2j) \sim (2k, 2j - 1)$	$(0, 2j) \sim (1, 2k + 2j)$
$(1, 2k + 2j) \sim \overline{(2k, 4k - 2j - 1)}$	$(0, 4k - 2j) \sim (2k, 4k - 2j - 1)$
$(2k, 2j + 1) \sim (2k - 1, 2k + 2j + 1)$	$(0, 4k - 2j - 2) \sim \overline{(2k - 1, 2k + 2j + 1)}$
$(0, 2j) \sim (2k, 2j + 1)$	$(0, 2j) \sim (2k, 2j + 1)$

for $1 \leq j < k$. Suppose first that $j = 1$ and $k > 1$. We know already that $(0, 2) \sim (2k, 1)$. Now $(2k, 4k - 3)$ cannot be joined to $(0, 4k - 4)$, because that would make a short circuit; it cannot be joined to $(0, 4k - 2)$, because the neighbors of $(0, 4k - 2)$ are known. So we have $(2k, 4k - 3) \sim (2k - 1, 6k - 3) = \overline{(1, 2k + 2)}$. This implies $(1, 2k + 2) \not\sim (0, 2)$, so $(0, 2) \sim (2k, 3)$. We also have a path

$$(2k - 1, 2k + 3) \sim \dots \sim (1, 2k + 2) \sim \overline{(2k, 4k - 3)} \sim \dots \sim \overline{(0, 4k - 4)};$$

hence $(2k - 1, 2k + 3) \not\sim (2k, 4k + 3) = \overline{(0, 4k - 4)}$. This forces $(2k - 1, 2k + 3) \sim (2k, 3)$. The proof for $j = 1$ is complete.

Suppose the relations have been proved for some $j < k - 1$. If j is odd, we have $(0, 4k - 2j - 2) \not\sim (2k, 4k - 2j - 1)$ and $(0, 4k - 2j - 2) \not\sim (1, 6k - 2j - 2) = \overline{(2k - 1, 2k + 2j + 1)}$; hence $(0, 4k - 2j - 2) \sim (2k, 4k - 2j - 3)$. Also $(0, 2j + 2) \not\sim (2k, 2j + 1)$; we must have $(2k, 2j + 3) \sim (0, 2j + 2) \sim (1, 2k + 2j + 2)$. And there's a path

$$(2k - 1, 2k + 2j + 3) \sim \dots \sim (1, 2k + 2j + 2) \sim \dots \sim (2k, 2j + 3),$$

so $(2k - 1, 2k + 2j + 3) \not\sim (2k, 2j + 3)$. This forces $(2k - 1, 2k + 2j + 3) \sim (2k, 4k + 2j + 3) = \overline{(0, 4k - 2j - 4)}$. The required relations for $j + 1$ have been established.

If j is even, we have proved that $(2k, 2j + 1) \not\sim (2k - 1, 2k + 2j + 1)$, so $(2k, 2j + 1) \sim (0, 2j + 2)$. Also $(2k, 4k - 2j - 3) \not\sim (0, 4k - 2j - 2)$, and $(2k, 4k - 2j - 3) \not\sim (0, 4k - 2j - 4)$ because of a short circuit; so $(2k, 4k - 2j - 3) \sim (2k - 1, 6k - 2j - 3) = \overline{(1, 2k + 2j + 2)}$. This implies $(0, 2j + 2) \not\sim (1, 2k + 2j + 2)$, so $(0, 2j + 2) \sim (2k, 2j + 3)$. Finally, the path

$$(2k - 1, 2k + 2j + 3) \sim \dots \sim (1, 2k + 2j + 2) \sim \overline{(2k, 4k - 2j - 3)} \sim \dots \sim \overline{(0, 4k - 2j - 4)}$$

shows that $(2k - 1, 2k + 2j + 3) \not\sim (2k, 4k + 2j + 3) = \overline{(0, 4k - 2j - 4)}$; we must have $(2k - 1, 2k + 2j + 3) \sim (2k, 2j + 3)$.

Now that the induction on j is complete, we have deduced the entire Hamiltonians circuit with the exception of one link from one vertex (and its complement). More precisely, when $k > 1$ is odd we have found the Hamiltonian path

$$\begin{aligned} (2k, 2k - 1) &\sim (0, 2k - 2) \sim (1, 4k - 2) \sim \dots \sim (2k - 1, 4k - 1) \sim \overline{(0, 2k)} \sim \dots \sim \overline{(2k, 2k + 1)} \\ &\sim \overline{(0, 2k + 2)} \sim \dots \sim \overline{(2k, 2k + 3)} \sim (1, 4k - 4) \sim \dots \sim (2k - 1, 4k - 3) \\ &\sim (2k, 2k - 3) \sim (0, 2k - 4) \sim (2k, 2k - 5) \\ &\sim \dots \sim (2k, 1) \sim \dots \sim \overline{(2k, 1)} \sim \dots \sim \overline{(2k, 2k - 1)}; \end{aligned}$$

when k is even we have found another,

$$\begin{aligned}
(0, 2k) &\sim \dots \sim (2k, 2k+1) \sim \overline{(1, 4k-2)} \sim \dots \sim \overline{(2k-1, 4k-1)} \sim \overline{(2k, 2k-1)} \sim \overline{(0, 2k-2)} \\
&\sim \overline{(2k, 2k-3)} \sim \overline{(0, 2k-4)} \sim \overline{(1, 4k-4)} \sim \dots \sim \overline{(2k-1, 4k-3)} \\
&\sim (0, 2k+2) \sim \dots \sim (2k, 2k+3) \sim (0, 2k+4) \\
&\sim \dots \sim (2k, 4k-1) \sim \overline{(2k, 4k-1)} \sim \dots \sim \overline{(0, 2k)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The endpoints are not adjacent, so it is impossible to complete a circuit. $\square$

Willcocks [8] also conjectured that square boards with side $< 2(r+s)$ do *not* yield Hamiltonian graphs. Using a slight extension of the methods above we can in fact prove a bit more:

Theorem 8. *An $\{r, s\}$ -leaper has no Hamiltonian circuit on an $m \times n$ board when $2s \leq m \leq n < 2(r+s)$.*

Proof. We may assume that $2 \leq r < s$. We show first that there is no Hamiltonian circuit on an $m \times n$ board when $m = 2s$ and n is arbitrary. Say that vertex (x, y) is type A if $x < s$ and $x \equiv t \pmod{2r}$, or if $x \geq s$ and $x \equiv r+s+t \pmod{2r}$, where

$$t = \begin{cases} s \bmod 2r, & \text{if } s \bmod 2r < r; \\ 0 & \text{if } s \bmod 2r > r. \end{cases}$$

Similarly, say that (x, y) is type B if $x < s$ and $x \equiv r+t$, or $x \geq s$ and $x \equiv s+t \pmod{2r}$. Otherwise (x, y) is type C . Let $s = 2kr + s'$, where $0 \leq s' < 2r$. If $s' < r$, we have $t = s'$, so the vertices of type A are those in ranks $t, t+2r, \dots, t+(2k-2)r, 2t+(2k+1)r, \dots, 2t+(4k-1)r$, while those of type B are in ranks $t+r, t+3r, \dots, t+(2k-1)r, 2t+2kr, \dots, 2t+(4k-2)r$. If $s' > r$, we have $t = 0$, so the vertices of type A have ranks $0, 2r, \dots, 2kr, s'+(2k+1)r, \dots, s'+(4k+1)r$ while those of type B have ranks $r, 3r, \dots, (2k+1)r, s'+2kr, \dots, s'+4kr$. In both cases there are exactly as many vertices of type B as type A , and every neighbor of a type A vertex has type B . This rules out a Hamiltonian circuit, as in Theorem 7.

To complete the proof, we must show that no Hamiltonian circuit is possible on an $m \times n$ board when $2s < m \leq n < 2(r+s)$. Let $x = \min(m-2s, r) - 1$, $y = \min(n-2s, r) - 1$. Then the short circuit

$$\begin{aligned}
&(x, y), (x+r, y+s), (x, y+2s), (x+s, y+2s-r), (x+2s, y+2s), \\
&(x+2s-r, y+s), (x+2s, y), (x+s, y+r), (x, y)
\end{aligned}$$

is forced. $\square$

It would be very interesting to see a proof of Willcocks's general Hamiltonian circuit conjecture. A presumably simpler problem, but also of interest, is to characterize the smallest boards on which leaper graphs are biconnected. The next cases to consider are perhaps those in which r and s are consecutive elements of the sequence 1, 2, 5, 12, 29, 70, 169, ... defined by the recurrence $A_{k+1} = 2A_k + A_{k-1}$. This choice makes the angles between the eight leaper moves as nearly equal

as possible; we have proved the conjecture only in the cases where those angles are as unequal as possible.

The results above suggest several additional open problems. For example, what is the diameter of the $\{r, s\}$ -leaper graph on an $(r+s) \times (2s)$ board, when the conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied? What is the 3-dimensional analog of Theorem 1?

What is the smallest n for which $\{1, 2k\}$ -leapers can make a Hamiltonian circuit of a $(2k+1) \times n$ board? The proof of Theorem 7 shows that such circuits have an intriguing structure. When $k = 1$, the answer is 10 (see Bergholt [13]), but for larger values of k it appears likely that the answer is $12k$. This conjecture is true, at any rate, when $k = 2$; also $n \geq 36$ is necessary when $k = 3$.

Theorem 3 provides a lower bound for certain Hamiltonian graphs, but it is not the best possible result of its kind. The lower bound on n can, for example, be raised by 2 whenever r is a multiple of 4, because we can extend the argument in the proof as follows: Suppose $r = 2k$ and $n = (s+4)s - 1$. Then the files that are not R or L are $[a, a]$ for $1 \leq a \leq k+2$; $[a+1, a]$ and $[a+2, a]$, for $1 \leq a \leq k+1$; $[a+3, a]$ for $1 \leq a \leq k$; $[a, 1]$ for $4 < a \leq k+2$; and the complements of those files. As before we call files $[a, b]$ and $\overline{[a, b]}$ odd or even according as a is odd or even. It turns out that the odd files have $2r - 4$ more unspecified neighbors than the even files do. All links go between an odd file and an even file, except for a link from $[k+2, 1]$ to $\overline{[k+2, 1]}$. So the odd excess can be dissipated only if the special connection from $[k+2, 1]$ to $\overline{[k+2, 1]}$ goes from odd to odd. A Hamiltonian circuit is therefore impossible if k is even.

This result is best possible when $r = 4$, because numerous $\{4, 5\}$ -leaper tours exist on a 9×46 board. Here, for example, is one that can be found using the method Euler [9] proposed for ordinary knights:

1	$\overline{133}$	$\overline{60}$	$\overline{103}$	$\overline{94}$	$\overline{117}$	173	$\overline{143}$	$\overline{202}$	$\overline{19}$	9	$\overline{41}$	$\overline{76}$	$\overline{85}$	183	156	31	$\overline{17}$	11	$\overline{27}$	$\overline{190}$	$\overline{49}$	83	162	...
$\overline{135}$	58	$\overline{105}$	$\overline{124}$	$\overline{67}$	$\overline{96}$	$\overline{115}$	175	$\overline{141}$	$\overline{206}$	$\overline{43}$	$\overline{78}$	$\overline{87}$	$\overline{126}$	$\overline{69}$	181	158	$\overline{204}$	196	$\overline{188}$	$\overline{47}$	$\overline{150}$	164	185	...
56	$\overline{107}$	$\overline{122}$	168	$\overline{128}$	$\overline{65}$	98	$\overline{113}$	177	$\overline{137}$	80	$\overline{89}$	$\overline{148}$	166	$\overline{36}$	$\overline{71}$	179	$\overline{139}$	$\overline{186}$	$\overline{45}$	151	46	187	$\overline{195}$	...
$\overline{109}$	$\overline{120}$	170	$\overline{146}$	4	$\overline{130}$	$\overline{63}$	$\overline{100}$	$\overline{111}$	54	$\overline{91}$	153	$\overline{199}$	$\overline{22}$	6	$\overline{38}$	$\overline{73}$	$\overline{52}$	$\overline{163}$	$\overline{82}$	48	189	$\overline{197}$	$\overline{24}$	...
$\overline{118}$	172	$\overline{144}$	$\overline{201}$	$\overline{20}$	2	$\overline{132}$	$\overline{61}$	$\overline{102}$	$\overline{93}$	155	30	$\overline{16}$	12	$\overline{26}$	8	$\overline{40}$	$\overline{75}$	$\overline{84}$	50	191	28	$\overline{14}$	14	...
95	$\overline{116}$	174	$\overline{142}$	$\overline{207}$	$\overline{134}$	59	$\overline{104}$	$\overline{125}$	68	182	157	$\overline{203}$	$\overline{18}$	10	$\overline{42}$	$\overline{77}$	$\overline{86}$	184	161	32	193	24	197	...
$\overline{66}$	$\overline{97}$	$\overline{114}$	176	$\overline{136}$	$\overline{57}$	$\overline{106}$	$\overline{123}$	167	$\overline{127}$	$\overline{70}$	180	$\overline{140}$	$\overline{205}$	$\overline{44}$	$\overline{79}$	$\overline{88}$	$\overline{149}$	165	$\overline{35}$	159	34	195	$\overline{187}$	...
$\overline{129}$	$\overline{64}$	$\overline{99}$	$\overline{112}$	55	$\overline{108}$	$\overline{121}$	169	$\overline{147}$	5	$\overline{37}$	$\overline{72}$	178	$\overline{138}$	$\overline{81}$	$\overline{90}$	152	$\overline{198}$	$\overline{23}$	$\overline{194}$	$\overline{33}$	$\overline{160}$	$\overline{185}$	$\overline{164}$	...
3	$\overline{131}$	$\overline{62}$	$\overline{101}$	$\overline{110}$	$\overline{119}$	171	$\overline{145}$	$\overline{200}$	$\overline{21}$	7	$\overline{39}$	$\overline{74}$	$\overline{53}$	$\overline{92}$	154	29	$\overline{15}$	13	$\overline{25}$	$\overline{192}$	$\overline{51}$	$\overline{162}$	$\overline{83}$	...

(Only the left portion of the board is shown; the right half is reversed and complemented, so that the full tour has 180° symmetry. A bar over a number means that 207 should be added.)

A similar argument shows that the lower bound for $r = 5$ can be raised from 52 to 56, and that a symmetric $\{5, 6\}$ -leaper tour does exist on an 11×56 board.

For $r \geq 6$, the lower bounds derived above are not optimum, but more powerful methods will be needed to establish the best possible results. Computer algorithms for the general symmetric traveling salesrep problem show that the $\{6, 7\}$ -leaper graph on a 13×76 board is not Hamiltonian; in fact, at least 18 additional edges are needed to make a Hamiltonian circuit possible. This result [14] was obtained and verified by two independently developed computer codes, one by Giovanni

Rinaldi and Manfred Padberg, the other by Michael Jünger, Gerhard Reinelt, and Stefan Thienel. It is interesting to note that the lower bound of 18 can be obtained simply from a linear programming model with the constraint that each vertex has degree 2. If each edge of the graph has weight 0 and each edge not in the graph has weight 1, a tour of total weight 18 turns out to be possible.

Leaper graphs should provide good challenges for all such computer codes. Michael Jünger [15] has recently used his program to verify Willcocks's conjecture when $r + s = 15$, so the smallest unsettled cases are now $\{r, 17 - r\}$ -leapers for $2 \leq r \leq 7$. Jünger [16] has also found the smallest Hamiltonian graphs of $\{r, r + 1\}$ -leapers on $(2r + 1) \times n$ boards when $r = 6$ ($n = 92$) and $r = 7$ ($n = 106$).

References

- [1] Édouard Lucas, *Récréations Mathématiques* **4** (Paris, 1894).
- [2] Anthony Dickins, *A Guide to Fairy Chess* (Richmond, Surrey: The Q Press, 1967).
- [3] C. St J. A. Nash-Williams, “Abelian groups, graphs and generalized knights,” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **55** (1959), 232–238.
- [4] George P. Jelliss, “Theory of leapers,” *Chessics* **2**, number 24 (Winter 1985), 86–98.
- [5] George P. Jelliss, “Generalized knights and Hamiltonian tours,” preprint dated 3 September 1993.
- [6] T. R. Dawson, problem in *L’Echiquier* (Brussels), 1928, pages 985 and 1054.
- [7] M. Frolow, *Les Carrés Magiques* (Paris, 1886).
- [8] G. P. Jelliss and T. H. Willcocks, “The five free leapers,” *Chessics* **1**, number 2 (July 1976), 2; number 6 (August 1978), 4–5.
- [9] L. Euler, “Solution d’une question curieuse qui ne paroît soumise à aucune analyse,” *Mémoires de l’Académie Royale des Sciences et Belles Lettres* (Berlin, 1759), 310–337.
- [10] E. Huber-Stockar, problem 6304, *Fairy Chess Review* **5**, number 16 and 17 (1945), 124, 134.
- [11] C. F. de Jaenisch, *Traité des Applications de l’Analyse Mathématique au Jeu des Echecs*, St. Petersburg, 1862–1863, volume 2.
- [12] C. Flye Sainte-Marie, “Note sur un problème relatif à la marche du cavalier sur l’échiquier,” *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France* **5** (1877), 144–150.
- [13] E. Bergholt, Letter to the editor, *The British Chess Magazine*, 1918, page 74.
- [14] Michael Jünger and Giovanni Rinaldi, electronic communications from the University of Cologne, 29 March 1994.
- [15] Michael Jünger, electronic communication from the University of Cologne, 8 April 1994.
- [16] Michael Jünger, electronic communication from the University of Cologne, 11 April 1994.